DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 580 FL 010 459

AUTHOR Johns, T. F.; And Others
TITLE Team-Teaching of Subject-Specific English to Overseas Postgraduate Students.
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 21p.; A portion of this document was included in the University of Birmingham "Teaching News," No. 5, 1978; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Language Programs; Communicative Competence (Languages); Composition Skills (Literary); Comprehension; *English (Second Language); *English for Special Purposes; Foreign Students; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Language Proficiency; *Language Skills; *Professional Education; Second Language Learning; Student Needs; Study Skills; *Team Teaching
IDENTIFIERS *English for Academic Purposes; University of Aston (England); University of Birmingham (England)

ABSTRACT

A description of team-teaching at the English for Overseas Students Unit (EOSU) of the University of Birmingham, by T. F. Johns and Tony Dudley-Evans, is followed by "The Current Programme of Materials Development in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) at the Universities of Birmingham and Aston" by T. F. and C. M. Johns. The team-teaching program for foreign postgraduate students in plant biology, development administration, and transportation involves joint classroom presentations by an EOSU teacher and a subject specialist. The first term emphasizes global understanding, understanding of detail, and vocabulary. The second term introduces students to answering essay questions in their subect area. Courses described herein that are offered to foreign post graduate students of widely differing backgrounds by the EAP program include an intensive presessional course, pronunciation, remedial grammar, spelling and word formation, note-taking and note reconstitution, structured dialogues, academic writing, listening comprehension, seminar strategies, overseas development administration texts, technical English, and language in the classroom. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED172580

TEAM-TEACHING OF SUBJECT-SPECIFIC ENGLISH TO OVERSEAS POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

T.F. Johns
C.M. Johns
Tony Dudley-Evans

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. F. Johns

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FL010 459

TEAM-TEACHING OF SUBJECT-SPECIFIC ENGLISH TO OVERSEAS POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS

Since 1971, the work of the English for Overseas Students Unit has concentrated on the 'common-core' language problems of overseas postgraduate students across as wide a range of subject areas as possible. Within the overall programme these problems are identified both from the standpoint of the form of the target language, and from the standpoint of the functions to which language will be put in the overseas student's life in a British industrial city and - more particularly - his work in a British University department. Courses defined formally include Remedial Grammar, Vocabulary Studies and Pronunciation, while those defined functionally include Academic Writing, Scientific Report Writing, Structured Dialogues, Listening Comprehension, and Note-taking and Reconstitution (the last of these taught on the two-week pre-sessional course). The programme is elective in that, with the advice of the Unit, students select that course or combination of classes which is most likely to meet their particular needs.

This approach has raised a number of problems which have suggested that it needs to be supplemented by subject-specific courses for those departments which accept numbers of overseas postgraduate students. The first problem is the practical one of timetabling. With some M.Sc. courses involving over 25 hours of subject tuition a week, it is difficult for the students to find the time to attend classes in the Unit: in addition, with students from over 20 departments in all Faculties attending courses in the Unit it is impossible to find times for classes which can be attended by all the students who may need them. A partial solution to this problem has been found by holding classes in the lunch break (1.00-2.00pm) and in the late afternoon (5.00-6.00pm) and by designing teaching handouts in such a way that they can also be used on an access basis by students who are unable to attend classes: nevertheless, the problem remains.

Secondly, there is the problem of co-ordination and information. With up to 50 students attending each of the more popular 'common-core' courses, it is difficult to keep track of the progress being made by each of the 200 or so students attending classes in the Unit, and it is impossible to keep all departments informed on a regular basis as to how their own students are getting on. Moreover, an overseas student's failure to keep pace with a course can rarely be attributed to 'knowledge of the language' or 'knowledge of the subject' alone: most often, these factors are inextricably intertwined. There exists at present no clear framework within which the subject-teacher and the language-teacher can discuss the problem of a student who may be falling behind, or for determining the remedial action that may be appropriate.

Thirdly, there are problems in dealing with all language difficulties on a 'common-core' basis. The experience of the past 6 years has shown the extent to which the communicative uses to which English is put across all subjects does, in fact, show more points of similarity than difference. In all academic subjects the language is used to describe structure and process, to give precise expression of spatial and temporal and cause-and-effect relationships, to identify and define, to hypothesise and syllogise, to refer to and evaluate previous academic research and debate, and so forth. There is, in short, a pattern of argument and a way of using English to convey that argument which makes 'Academic English' as clearly marked and specifiable a variety of the language as, say 'Advertising English' or 'Newspaper English'. Nevertheless, there remain differences between the way English is used in different subjects: in vocabulary, for example, the technical terms of the subject, and the way they are related to each other (so that to learn the exact relationships within the vocabulary of a subject is, indeed, to learn that subject); in syntax, in the linguistic realisation of such basic concepts as cause and effect. Subject differences also place restrictions on the effectiveness of language-teaching strategies in a remedial programme. In teaching comprehension of spoken and written English, for example, it is possible on a 'common-core' basis to teach certain strategies for picking up the 'minimal clues' which enable a listener/reader to interpret the speaker/writer's argument: however, it is

difficult except in a subject-specific context to exploit 'realia' such as course lectures or technical written texts since the subject-matter places barriers to understanding for students outside the subject area - or, indeed, to students within the subject area to whom that lecture or text is not relevant at the time it is used for language-teaching purposes. The criterion of relevance is indeed a central factor in the teaching of comprehension: for 'understanding' a text must include understanding the significance of the text within the overall teaching/learning process. How does the information relate in terms of what is 'given' and what is 'new' to information already acquired? How far does it confirm/supplement the receiver's conceptual framework, or modify that framework? What use will the student be expected to make of the information? The language-teacher is unable to answer questions such as these without reference to the subject-teacher: in the absence of the answers, the teaching of comprehension can easily become an arid affair, divorced from the contextual factors which are always present when 'real' comprehension takes place.

The fourth problem is that of validation and feedback. The construction of a 'common-core' course depends on the identification of features of target behaviour and student difficulty across a wide range of subjects. This involves research and a readiness not to be always 'material bound' in that initial hypotheses and approaches must be open to refinement and revision in the light of experience. The student's role in feedback is crucial: for example, in teaching writing, the principal criterion against which the course is validated is the success - or otherwise - of the students in applying the 'common-core' principles embodied in the teaching materials in short texts (i.e. a section of a dissertation, extended essay or scientific report) on their own work in their own subject area. However, it is important also to be in touch with the situation of students 'on the ground' in as wide a range of departments as possible: what are the day-to-day demands made on English or overseas students, and how successful are they in meeting them?

In this connection it is important not to overlook the expectations and reactions of subject-teachers. There is clearly danger if the priorities for effective communication accepted by the language-teacher diverge from the criteria applied by the subject-teacher. To take a simple example: among the 'mechanical errors' made by non-native speakers from many different language backgrounds, the inability to apply the principles that underlie the insertion or non-insertion of the definite article (the principles that for the native speaker distinguish THE chemical industry from (zero) heavy industry) is among the most widespread and most persistent. Nowadays most language-teachers would assign a fairly low priority to teaching the correct use of the definite article on the grounds that it has low 'communicative value': that is to say, English in which the definite article is randomly distributed, or - as in telegrams or newspaper headlines - omitted altogether, remains perfectly comprehensible. In our opinion there are linguistic counter arguments to this view of 'communicative value': leaving them aside, there is evidence that some subject-teachers may be highly sensitive to these 'mechanical errors' - for example, in scoring examination answers - and the language-teacher ignores them at his students' peril. The extent to which feedback and validation can be obtained within a langugage-teaching programme from both students and staff are, then, necessarily limited: and the very nature of a 'common-core' programme implies that the language-teacher is also, and concurrently, engaged at the 'cutting-edge' of departmental contact between teacher and student, investigating and attempting to deal with language problems as they arise.

For these reasons, the work of the Unit has extended recently to subject-specific 'team-teaching' in the Department of Transportation and Environmental Planning, the Department of Plant Biology and the Diploma in Development Administration course of the Institute of Local Government Studies. In contrast with 'common-core' classes the groups are kept small (10-12 students maximum) in order that students should be given an opportunity for individual attention.

The groups are selected on the basis of results on the Assessment and Diagnostic Test in English taken by all overseas students on arrival at the University, preference being given to students with lower scores on the test.

It was decided after discussion with departments and students that in Transportation and Plant Biology emphasis should be given in the first term to comprehension - in particular comprehension of lectures. Each class meets once a week, and is 'team-taught' by a subject-teacher and an EOSU teacher, a time-table having been worked out with the department so that subject-teachers take part on a rota basis. One of the subject-teacher's lectures is recorded in the week preceding the class, and forms the basis for the work done. In the first term's programme we concentrate on the following:

1. Global Understanding

Questions are asked to check whether the students have understood the main points of the lecture: these are usually answered without reference to the students' notes. Activities for checking global understanding include placing in the correct order a list of the main points of the lecture, and showing that the overall argument of the lecture has been grasped by completing a diagram (e.g. a flow-chart, a matrix, or a tree-diagram).

2. Understanding of Detail

Students answer questions on some of the subsidiary points in the lecture, including the lecturer's examples and 'asides': students are usually allowed to refer to their notes. The purpose of this part of the session is to discover how accurately students understand and record detailed information and - more important - whether they understand its relevance to the main argument. Activities include blank-filling, true/false questions, and diagramming.

The work on understanding allows students to catch up on points missed or misunderstood in the lecture, and on terms or concepts assumed by the lecturer to be familiar. It also gives the lecturer the opportunity to assess how much students have understood, and to clear up any misunderstandings. The work in this part of the session usually starts with the language-teacher questionning the students, the subject-teacher acting as 'consultant', and ends with the students questioning the subject-teacher on points of information, clarification, and application, the language-teacher acting as 'monitor' and occasionally as 'mediator'.

3. Vocabulary

The overseas student usually identifies his problems in English as 'not knowing enough words'. In the past language-teachers have tended to underestimate the importance of vocabulary and to concentrate on structure. In redressing the balance, there are problems in a 'common-core' course in that the words and expressions that a students needs to be able to understand, and those he needs to be able to use, differ from subject to subject. A subject-specific class gives an opportunity to study the problems students have in acquiring vocabulary and using it accurately. The recording of the lecture is analysed with reference to the following main areas:

3.1. Technical Vocabulary The problems here are mainly of spelling: of pronunciation (particularly the assignment of stress in polysyllabic terms): of morphology (e.g. understanding the principles underlying word-formation): and of the semantic relationships between technical terms (for example, that plants may be classified as herbaceous or woody: that a seed may be orthodox or recalcitrant from the point of view of storage, and so on).

3.2. Semi-technical Vocabulary Here the emphasis is on vocabulary which is part of the 'common stock' of the language but which is exploited in a particular way in a particular subject. For example, the verbs of action and process (e.g. deplete, yield, affect, effect, withstand) and the verbs of implication (e.g. X suggests, points out, goes so far as to say that...).

3.3. Colloquial Vocabulary An overseas student may have acquired in his own country a good knowledge of the written language of the subject, but still be puzzled by the colloquial words and expressions used by a lecturer when he talks about the subject (e.g. 'This is pretty difficult','We'll need to jack up the

figures', 'Do you want to hedge your bets?' 'Well, you pays your money and you takes your choice'). Here the work concentrates on developing the student's ability to guess the meaning of colloquialisms in context, and finding equivalents in formal written English.

4. Follow-up Work

This may include activities - usually designed by the subject-teacher - to discover if the students are able to put into practice the material in the lecture (these have ranged from describing characters of flowers in Plant Biology to designing a road in Transportation): reading a short text related to the lecture: or doing short pieces of writing (e.g. definitions and descriptions) related to the lecture.

The first term's work with the group of students on the Diploma in Development Administration course also concentrates on comprehension, but of written rather than spoken English. The emphasis is on rapid and effective 'recovery' of the writer's argument from texts, many of which are chosen by the students themselves as being difficult to understand from their set or recommended reading. The first term's DDA work is not at present team-taught.

The second term's work in Transportation, Plant Biology, and the Diploma in Development Administration centres on writing, with the emphasis on planning and writing of examination questions. Each session is taught with the subject-teacher responsible for the question or questions studied, and has three major components.

1. Close Reading of examination questions

1.1. Conventions of examination language (e.g. How far -, discuss critically/with reference to, compare and contrast).

1.2. Assessment of examiner's intentions and expectations: the participation of the subject-teacher is here clearly essential!

1.3. Perception of structure of answer implicit in question.

2. Planning of answer

This is done through discussion on a group basis, and involves:

2.1. Structuring of possible answer. In addition to basic 'linear' methods such as listing of points to be made, we encourage students to organise information and argument in a 'non-linear' way through diagrams, linking the work on production in the second term to that on comprehension in the first.

2.2. Discussion of relevance of students' own points in relation to the overall framework.

2.3. Initial decisions as to presentation of answer: e.g. ordering of points, paragraphing.

3. Writing-up

Students select a section of the planned structure of the answer, and write it up individually under time pressure (one, or at most two, paragraphs). Where possible, students' work is checked by both subject-teachers and language-teachers.

It should be emphasised that this work is still in an experimental stage: we are all - language-teachers, subject-teachers, and students - learning from each other how to make the best use of the opportunities offered by team-teaching. As language-teachers we have found that it has done a good deal to help solve the problems outlined at the beginning of this report: we have particularly valued the co-operation of subject-teachers in examining and attempting to deal with language problems as they arise in the course of a teaching programme. We believe that most subject-teachers have valued an opportunity for a type of feedback that is not always available on a postgraduate course. As to the students, they have participated willingly and at times enthusiastically: their comments and suggestions have helped to shape the programme, and the experience of the three departments has indicated a definite improvement in their English as shown by end-of-course examinations. The major problem for the future is that with the present resources of EOSU it will be impossible for us to extend this work far beyond the handful of departments in which it is being carried on at present.

Tim Johns, Tony Dudley-Evans,
English for Overseas Students Unit.

THE CURRENT PROGRAMME OF MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT IN ENGLISH FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES AT THE UNIVERSITIES OF BIRMINGHAM & ASTON

T.F. & C.M. Johns

Student Population 1

Structure of Courses

A Courses with Syllabuses Formally Defined 2

1. Pronunciation 3
2. Remedial Grammar 4
3. Spelling and Word-formation 6

B Courses with Syllabuses Functionally Defined

1. Note-taking and Note Reconstitution 6
2. Structured Dialogues 7
3. Academic Writing Course 8
4. Academic Writing: Remedial Sheets 9
5. Listening Comprehension: Discussion Texts 10
6. Seminar Strategies 12

C Courses for Students in Particualr Subject-areas

1. Overseas Development Administration Texts 13
2. Technical English 14
3. Language in the Classroom 14

April, 1975

This background paper describes the teaching materials in the field of EAP (English for Academic Purposes) developed by T.F. Johns at the University of Birmingham since 1971, jointly with C.M. Johns at the University of Aston since 1973. The emphasis is on the materials themselves and the purposes we have designed them to serve, and little or no reference is made to any theory of EAP that underlies them or that has arisen out of them, although hints of the theoretical base that we have found useful may, on occasion, be detected in the metalanguage we have used to explain what we are doing. We should, however, wish to record our indebtedness to the theoretical work in discourse analysis ongoing in the Department of English, in particular by John Sinclair, Malcolm Coulthard, and David Brazil. They are not, on the other hand, responsible for the uses to which we have on occasion put their ideas: the many flaws and failings of the materials described in this paper are entirely our responsibility.

Student population

The materials described have been prepared for postgraduate students from overseas who have difficulties with English. In addition, at Birmingham teaching is provided for overseas undergraduates in their preliminary year in the Faculty of Science and Engineering. In 1974/5 the number of overseas postgraduates 'at risk' to a greater or lesser degree because of inadequate English was 125 at Birmingham, and 100 at Aston: taking both universities together this represented 18% of all overseas postgraduate students. Those with language difficulties show wide variation on the following parameters:

a) Subject of Study

The students come from approximately 25 different departments at Birmingham, and 15 at Aston. Subjects being studied include Engineering (Mechanical, Chemical, Electrical, and Production), Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Genetics, Medecine, Mathematics, Economics, Econometrics, Sociology, Accounting, Overseas Development Administration, Management Science, Transportation, Meteorology, Geography, History, English, and Theology.

b) Mode of Study

Most are following one and two year post-experience courses leading to a diploma or an MSc: there are aalso a number doing research for an MSc or PhD or as postdoctoral research fellows, and a small proportion of occasional students.

c) Country of Origin

They come from over 30 different countries, and almost as many language backgrounds. The largest national groups come from Turkey, Japan, Iraq, Iran, Latin America, Malaysia, and Egypt and the Sudan.

d) Competence and Needs in English

The widest possible variation, from near-beginners to students with a good overall competence in English who need to improve a particular English language skill (e.g. academic writing, or note-taking).

e) Age

The age (and therefore that component of language-learning aptitude that may be associated with age) of our postgraduate students ranges from the early twenties to the mid-fifties.

f) Motivation

While there is, on the whole, a fairly high level of extrinsic motivation, our students include those who become obsessively concerned with improving their knowledge of English, as well as those who are moderately uninterested in any form of language work

Structure of Courses

We prepare materials for two types of course:

1. Intensive Presessional Course for Arriving Postgraduate Students

This course is held in September immediately before the start of the academic year: in 1975 for 14 days at Aston, and 11 days at Birmingham. The programme involves a minimum of six hours' teaching a day, and is tightly integrated, the central integrative activity being the course on note-taking and reconstitution. (See B1 below).

2. Term-time Programme

The weight of the materials-based teaching is in the first two terms, the third term being reserved in the main for individual assistance in consultations, etc. The great variety of students on the parameters described above makes it impossible to cater effectively for their different needs by means of an integrated programme. The approach, therefore, is modular: we provide a number of largely independent courses, with one one-hour session a week for each course. Each student assembles a programme of courses that meet his individual needs (as assessed objectively by testing and subjectively on the basis of interview) and the constraints imposed by his departmental timetable or his programme of research. This flexible and largely elective method of programme assembly has a number of important consequences for the programme of materials development:

a) The goals, organisation, and methods of study of each course should be made as explicit as possible. For most courses, a handout is provided at the beginning of each term setting out what the course is intended to achieve, and what topics will be covered on a week-to-week basis. If a student decides to miss a particular session, he will do so in the knowledge of what teaching he will thereby be missing, and (we hope) having decided that that particular session is of less relevance to him than some of the others.

b) Because of the problems of timetabling and the competing claims of work in the subject, handouts for any session and (where appropriate) associated taped materials should be on access for students who wish to follow a course, but are unable to attend a particular session or sessions. This in turn means that they should be as adapted to self-study as class use, although we have not (with one or two exceptions done on an experimental basis) gone the whole way towards providing materials in a PI format.

c) Another consequence of the elective approach is that courses and the materials developed for teaching them are under constant revision on the basis of student feedback, including information obtained in interview and in class as to what students believe to be their language problems, error analysis, evidence of the effectiveness of particular courses or materials, and the indirect evidence of wastage (although in certain circumstances wastage may be taken as evidence of effectiveness rather than ineffectiveness!)

d) The importance of feedback implies that there is danger in a purely theory-based approach (and even more danger in a fashion-based approach) to EAP. The two main theoretical approaches to EAP syllabus construction may be termed the formal (that is to say, the syllabus is defined in terms of the phonological/syntactic/lexical features of the target language needed by a particular learner or group of learners) and the functional (that is, the syllabus is defined in terms of the uses to which the learner will need to put the language, whether defined on the basis of 'skills' or 'rhetorical acts'). It is our belief that, in practice, the two approaches often turn out to be not so very different, particularly if - as is implicit in discourse analysis - it is possible to approach problems of function in a structural framework. We have distinguished materials 'formally' and 'functionally' defined under A and B below, but the materials defined formally incorporate a substantial functional element, while the functionally defined materials retain features of formal presentation, and even, at places, of formal grading. It is, perhaps, worth noticing that the major problems of the two approaches are reciprocal, both involving questions of transfer and generalisation: contextualisation in the one type of syllabus, and what might be called

structuralisation in the other. Our justification for adopting both approaches is that this seems to meet best the needs of our students, and the attitudes they bring to the learning process itself: the problem that using both approaches entails is the pragmatic one of the trade-off between them.

e) One result of the very large number of subject-areas represented among the student population, and our limited resources for dealing with them, is that they attempt as far as possible to deal with the language problems of overseas students across all academic subjects rather than in terms of the (theoretically dubious) categories of 'English for Accountants', 'English for Chemical Engineers', etc. As a result, the programme has (with the exception of the materials described under C below) given only minor attention to what might be called the 'classic' EAP/EST strategy (e.g. the English Studies Series, Focus, and Special English among published materials) of taking (authentic or constructed) written texts within a particular subject area as the starting-point for comprehension and development work. However, as described below, our plans for future develpoments include the supplementing of units within certain 'common-core' courses with self-study practice materials relating the principles of the common-core unit to subject-based texts and exercises (c.f. work at Leeds and Tabriz).

f) An important characteristic of the overseas postgraduate student is that he is, in general, an experienced learner, and will tend to approach language-learning as he approaches the problem of learning in his own subject. In particular, he will tend to look for abstract organising principles underlying data, and be used to the idea of using those principles to organising further data. Of all language learners he is the most likely to react adversely to a crude 'habit-formation' teaching approach that rigorously avoids any form of overt explanation. As a result, the problems of explanation occupy a central position in the programme: the extent to which explanation should be induced from data or given, the balance and sequencing of explanation and practice, and above all the type of pedagogic explanation that is most appropriate,

Description of Courses and Course Materials

A Courses with Syllabuses Formally Defined

1. Pronunciation (Language Laboratory. 3 terms: 30 units)

This course is based on a progression from segmental features to suprasegmental (at level of syllable, word, nominal group, and tone-group). For pedagogic purposes, however, it has not always proved possible or desirable to preserve a rigid distinction between the levels: thus, in the early stages the work on segmental distinctions takes syllable-structure into account where relevant (e.g. in the work on voiced v. voiceless stops). We attempt, particularly in the first term's work, to cover as wide a range of possible L_1 interference effects as possible: for example, in the work on /l/ we include practice material on the /l/ v. /r/ distinction: discrimination between 'light' and 'dark' /l/ (e.g. 'I lend it' v. 'I'll end it'): and on syllabic /l/: the language laboratory presentation allows the student to concentrate on those areas that cause him most difficulty. Throughout the course the emphasis is on recognition of the relevant distinctions as much as on production: thus for segmentals each unit incorporates a before-and-after test that presents the distinctions (in the context of sentences spoken at normal speed rather than in isolated lexical items) as well as practice materials (minimal pairs & dialogues) that require production.

Segmentals and Syllables

Units prepared to date include:

Dental and alveolar stops and fricatives
Sibilant affricates
Approximants
Nasals
Voiced v. Voiceless stops
Vowel discriminations
Vowel length as determined by syllable structure
Final clusters

(Note, in case of misunderstandings, that the phonetic metalanguage of these labels is for our use only: it is not taught to the students! Nor do we require in these units any familiarity with phonetic transcription)

Assimilation

The emphasis here is on correct recognition of words in context where assimilation has taken place (i.e. the way in which in normal speech a morpheme-final consonant or consonants absorbs a characterisitic of a following morpheme-initial consonant). The materials include recognition from authentic spontaneous texts (c.f. B5 below).

Word and Complex Nominal Stress

The aim is to enable the student to be able to deduce the stressing of an unknown word and consequent vowel neutralisation from its morphophonemic structure or its word-class (e.g. /ˈikəˈnɒmiks/ v. /ɪˈkɒnəmɪst/, /ˈprɒdjʊs/ v. /prəˈdjus/) and the stressing of a complex nominal from the meaning-relationship between its elements (e.g. iron bar v. iron foundry), and, conversely, to deduce meaning from the evidence of stress.

Sentence-stress and Intonation

The work here is based on Halliday's model of description, though, necessarily, in an abbreviated form - we do little work on secondary choices. The emphasis is on form/function correspondences, using discrimination tests, meaningful drills, and dialogues, and (at Birmingham in 1974/5) incorporating analysis of native and foreign students' performance by means of a fundamental frequency analyser. Materials prepared to date include

Marked and unmarked tonality
Tonic Placement (including Tone 13)
Use of Tones 1 & 2 in questions and tags.
Contrastive Use of Tone 4.
Intensifying Use of Tone 5.

For this part of the course we find it necessary to make a graded presentation of the Halliday system of transcription, largely for the purpose of recognition. Much of this work (e.g. the emphasis on the correct placement of the tonic) is carried over into the Structured Dialogue course (see B2 below), although there no use is made of transcription.

2. Remedial Grammar (Classroom & Language Laboratory: 21 + 21 units)

This, it seems to us, is a central component of the programme, and one which makes considerable demands on a system which attempts to direct students towards only those courses, or parts of courses, which are directly relevant to their needs. What is needed for each student is a programme of remedial work that is directly related to his - individual and idiosyncratic - state of 'transitional competence' in the target language. We have, since 1971, constructed a (necessarily somewhat rough-and-ready) profile of that transitional comptence by means of an assessment and diagnostic test, which is administered to all overseas postgraduates enrolling for classes, and, at Birmingham, to all overseas undergraduates whose first language is not English on arriving at the University. From 1975/6 the test will be compulsory for all arriving overseas postgraduate at Birmingham. The test, which is at present under revision (we hope that it will be possible to computer-validate the first version in the summer of 1975) consists of a 130-item four-way multiple-choice battery. The matrix-scored answer-sheet is set out in such a way that 21 'diagnostic areas' can be rapidly read off horizontally by the scorer, 16 of the areas being defined by five test items (one horizontal row), and 5 by ten test items (two horizontal rows). The 'diagnostic areas' defined by the test are as follows:

1. Present & timeless time reference	(10 items)
2. Past time reference	(10 items)
3. Future time reference and modality	(10 items)
4. Modality: inference and probability	(5 items)
5. Modality: obligation	(5 items)
6. Modality: hypothetical	(5 items)
7. Tags	(5 items)
8. Complementation: predicate complementation	(10 items)
9. Complementation: double-object verbs	(5 items)
10. Verb + preposition collocations	(5 items)
11. Adjective + preposition collocations	(5 items)

12. Prepositions of Place	(5 items)
13. Prepositions of Time	(5 items)
14. Genetive Constructions	(5 items)
15. Determiners: definite v. indefinite	(5 items)
16. Determiners: quantifiers	(5 items)
17. Determiners: specification	(5 items)
18. Pronominalisation	(10 items)
19. Intensification and down-grading: simplex	(5 items)
20. Intensification and down-grading: complex	(5 items)
21. Word-order	(5 items)

A cursory inspection of the list will reveal a number of surprising omissions - some of them originally motivated by problems of 'testability' within this format - and, perhaps, some surprising inclusions. Even in advance of the validation, is is safe to assume that some ardas will probably be omitted in the second version (e.g. preposition usage), others extensively redefined (e.g. determination and complementation) and others introduced (e.g. passivisation, relativisation, & subject-verb number concord). The criteria taken for the defintion of each area were deliberately eclectic rather than systematic. Thus, areas 1 - 3 handle tense and aspect on the 'notional' basis of time-reference rather than according to formal criteria: thus, the discrimination present perfect v. present non-perfect is in area 1, while the discrimination present perfect v. past non-perfect is in area 2. Similarly, what in traditional grammars is called 'Conditional I' referring to future time comes in area 3, while 'Conditional II' occurs in 6, together with other examples of hypothetical reference. Modality (including modal verbs and adverbs) is also handled in terms of meaning in 4 and 5. Other areas (such as 10 & 11 and 19 and 20) are, on the other hand, dealt with - perhaps unsatisfactorily - on the basis of surface features, while others (e.g. Tags in area 7: the only area not as characterisitic for written as spoken English) take on board an area traditionally defined in pedagogic grammar (in the case of tags, involving such widely-differing criteria as transform-type and exchange-type). It is hoped that the consistency of each area, as defined by students' answers, will be examined in the validation.

In its <u>assessment</u> mode the test is mainly used to establish upper and lower limits. A score above 100/130 is taken to mean that only marginal assistance is likely to be needed - perhaps for 'polishing' purposes on one or two areas of grammar. A score below 65/130 is taken to signal a need for overall remedial action at an elementary level - for example, by 'keying in' the student to the appropriate level of <u>English 901</u> for self-study in the language-laboratory, his progress being monitored weekly in individual consultation. The <u>diagnostic</u> mode is applied to students whose scores fall between those limits. The criterion score on each area is taken to be 80% (i.e. 4/5 or 8/10). At the beginning of each of the first two terms a 'diagnosis sheet' is issued to each student, setting out the weekly programme, and indicating which sessions (identified by number) will deal with areas on which the student has fallen below the criterion score.

Each session of the remedial course is based on a classroom lesson, with a substantial handout which includes material which the student is expected to complete on his own, and a follow-up language laboratory lesson (1 day after the classroom lesson at Aston, 5 days after at Birmingham) to give additional oral practice. For the classroom materials we adopted at first an inductive presentation, students being presented with graded examples of the structure or structures in question, and tried to lead the students to discover the principles involved. However, the requirement of access for self-study (see b) on p.2) has caused us to move over to a more traditional method of presentation using substitution tables, simplified algorithms & transforms, etc. and a modicum of verbal explanation. Classroom practice is provided by 'quickfire' substitution dialogues and written exercises (blank-filling; multiple choice; text reconstruction; open-ended sentence completion) of a traditional kind. The follow-up language laboratory materials take the form of graded meaningful discrimination drills, in many cases using visual cues.

Depending as they do on the diagnostic areas as defined by the test, the further development of the units must depend to a large extent on the results of the test validation referred to above. (What has happened so far is that the revision effect

has gone the other way: the research and experience involved in preparing the remedial units has tended to show up the inadequacies of the test). We hope that it will also be possible in 1975/6 to start work on the provision of supplementary subject-oriented self-study materials as described at e) on p.3. These could involve three types of activity:

a) Identification of feature from subject-area: recovery of points of meaning dependent on feature.

b) Reconstruction of texts from subject-area, showing discrimination accrding to feature.

c) Extension of principles in common-core unit to difficulties characteristic of register of subject-area. (For example in the materials prepared for area 17 the distinction ∅ English history v. the English language is presented and explained: in the supplementary unit determination/physical science the principle would be extended to examples such as ∅ electron microscopy v. the electron microscope).

3. Spelling and Word-formation (Classroom. 1 term: 10 units)

Covering such topics as single and double consonants: vowel/spelling correspondences: meaning and form of prefixes and suffixes. Exemplificatory items are drawn from general academic and engineering texts. At Aston, this class immediately precedes the academic writing class (B3).

A possible future development which we would like to make is the inclusion of the material already prepared in a more general two-term course on academic lexis, which could include such further topics as strategies for deducing meaning of unknown items from form and context: collocation: and semantic relationships.

B Courses with Syllabuses Functionally Defined

There is multiple ambiguity attached to the notion of 'function' in language-teaching. In general, the courses described below are defined in relation to each other in terms of the skill involved, while internally the major part of the material in each course is presented in terms of its rhetorical function , taken in the widest sense. This double criterion means that there is a certain amount of overlapping between the topics covered in the different courses: thus, cross-reference in written texts is covered in the academic writing course (B3) and in spoken texts in the listening/comprehension course (B5).

1. Note-taking and Note Reconstitution (Presessional Course: 10 units)

This course is the central, and 'integrating' component of the presessional course for arriving overseas postgraduate students (see p. 2):

a) It is a language skill which is needed, for different purposes, by all postgraduate students, and one which many - even those with a reasonably good grasp of English - lack.

b) It involves both written and spoken English, and both reception and production. It therefore lends itself to that rapid variation of different tupes of activity that is necessary if concentration and enthusiasm are not to flag in the course of of an intensive programme.

c) It focusses the attention of the student on the written or spoken or written text as a message: on its meaning, and the meaning-relations that obtain within it.

The course materials have four main components, in the following order:

1) Elimination of redundant material (e.g. articles and copula verbs: repetitions and re-statements). Reconstitution concentrates on restoring grammatically redundant elements (relevant remedial grammar materials used where necessary).

2) Rephrasing and reordering information (e.g. single lexical item for complex idea).

3) Conventional abbreviations (including subject-specific abbreviations).

4) Symbolic representation of logical relationships within text (the work here is based in part on the ideas of Julian Dakin - see The Language Laboratory and Language Learning, Longmans 1973). Each relationship is presented in isolation, and then contrastively practised together with all the relationships previously presented. The relationships we have included, and the 'base' symbols are as follows:

Causation	$\rightarrow$	e.g. 'causes', 'leads to', 'brings about'
	$\nearrow$	e.g. 'raises', 'leads to an increase in'
Consequence	$\therefore$	e.g. 'therefore', 'as a result'
Contrast	$\flat$	e.g. 'but', 'however', 'on the other hand
Equivalence	$=$	e.g. 'is the same as', 'equals'
	$\simeq$	e.g. 'is approximately the same as'
Correlation	$\nearrow\!\!\nearrow$	e.g. 'correlates with', 'the more ... the more ...'
Class inclusion	$\ni$	e.g. 'includes'

The following conventions, when applied to the base symbols, extend the number of relationships that can be shown:

a) Left-right reversal of the symbol implies reversal of the relationship (e.g. $\leftarrow$ 'is caused by', 'results from', $\in$ 'is a member of the class', $\because$ 'because'). An exception to the convention is the traditional up-down reversal $\therefore$ 'therefore', 'as a result' / $\because$ 'because')

b) An oblique stroke through the symbol implies negation (e.g. $\not\rightarrow$ 'does not cause', $\neq$ 'is different from', $\not\nearrow\!\!\nearrow$ 'is not found in association with').

c) A point after the symbol implies an equivalent intransitive predicate (e.g. $\nearrow$ 'rises', 'becomes greater', $=$ 'remains constant').

Each unit includes practice in both note-taking and note reconstitution in both the written and spoken mode as follows:

	Note taking	Note reconstitution
Written	Taking notes from sentences (at first only inserting symbol), progressing within each unit to taking notes from paragraph (target notes at first 'gapped': extent of gapping gradually increased.	Restoring notes already taken on sentences & paragraphs to 'full form': writing paragraphs from given notes (target paragraphs at first presented in gapped form).
Spoken	Taking notes from spoken sentences, progressing to 'mini-lectures'. Same gradual withdrawal of assistance as above.	Reading aloud from notes already taken. Telling jokes, giving short 'mini-lectures' from given notes.

Further development for the 1975 presessional course will include additional units at stage 4), and the provision of a limited number of subject-specific written and spoken texts for individual practice.

2. Structured Dialogues (Classroom. 3 terms: 30 sessions, 50 dialogues)

This course is designed to help overseas students with problems of socialisation, both on and off the campus. The lay-out of the dialogues, and the indication of substitutions, is similar to that in Jerrom & Szkutnik Conversation Exercises in Everyday English (Longmans), but the starting-point is the way in which a situation can be handled in English (not only a question of the language, but also of cultural awareness) rather than on the syntactic structures that may be involved. The dialogues may be classified according to the defintion of 'situation' implicit in the title as a) Speech Act, b) Setting, or c) Topic. A few examples of each are:

a) Enquiries	b) At the doctor's	c) Assessment of Progress
Requests	At the bank	Responsibility
Invitations	In a pub	Remembering & Forgetting
Reproaches & Complaints	Shopping	Finding the way
Suggestions	On the telephone	Confidential gossip

We attempt, through the dialogue format, to draw the student's attention to to the rhetorical structure of interaction at the level of exchange (e.g. appropriate selection of presequences: 'Would you mind if I said something?' and prefaces: 'Well, ...'). The only grading is by complexity of rhetorical structure.

3. Academic Writing Course (Classroom. 2 terms: approx. 20 units)

This course is based on an attempt to define the communication problems common to overseas postgraduate students in writing essays, dissertations, and theses. The areas covered have been chosen on the basis of information from departments, study of 'target-type' texts in as wide a range of subjects as possible, and, above all, discussion with students and examination of their writing in individual consultation hours. The course may be seen as an extension of the Remedial Grammar Course (A2), in two senses:

a) It revises and practises in context the grammatical points on which remedial teaching has been given.

b) It presents, through context, certain syntactic/hypersyntactic features which are not at present covered in the Assessment and Diagnostic Test or in the associated teaching materials - for example, the intersentential features of cohesion and coherence (as distinguished by Henry Widdowson).

The areas covered are of four general types:

a) Strategies of Exposition

The topics are, as far as possible, presented in the same order that a student is likely to come across them in doing an extended piece of academic writing, and include:

1) Stating a Problem
2) Reference to and summary of the relevant literature
3) Generalisation, Particularisation, and Exemplification
4) Classification and Identification
5) Description of Process and Method
6) Causes and Results
7) Comparison and Contrast
8) Academic Mitigation
9) Arguing a Conclusion

Within each unit, it is important to show how the strategy in question relates to the conceptual structure of the student's subject and what he wishes to say or might wish to say about the subject. While there are points in the course where the linguistic realisation of the strategy (the form/function relationship) can be taught in terms of 'set phrases' or 'set structures' (presented in substitution tables or algorithms), it may also involve discriminations in rhetorical patterning, in syntactic structure, in lexis, in semantics (for example in semantic relationships and in presuppositions) and in the specialised conventions of academic writing (of the sort that are covered in 'Style Manuals' for dissertations & theses). A proportion of the practice materials therefore concentrates on establishing the relevant discriminations in exercises of various types. In addition, we give some work in parallel text construction and open-ended text completion. The goal of each unit (and the criterion by which we judge its success or failure) is that the student should finally be able, preferably under time-pressure, to construct an original paragraph or paragraphs in his own subject-area, using the material presented in the unit.

b) Numerical and Statistical Concepts

This may be regarded as a specialised extension of the material described under a). The units give practice in the ways in which information which can be shown in tabular or graphic form can be expressed verbally, and at the conventions in academic writing of cross-referring between text and diagram or table. The areas which we have found to be common to enough students within different departments to be worth covering on a 'common-core' basis are:

1) Measurement and Quantification
2) Change in time (the unit also covering change of state)
3) Distribution
4) Correlation

c) Interpretation of Writing Instructions

It has emerged, from contact with departments running postgraduate courses, and from contact with students themselves, that there is considerable difficulty in understanding the specialised conventions of essay questions in examinations and term-time assignments, and the type and organisation of the answer implicit in the question. We have, therefore, prepared a unit based on the analysis of some hundreds of examination questions drawn from a number of different departments in order to deal with this problem.

d) Intersentential Cohesion and Coherence

1. Features of Cohesion

We have to date prepared 6 units within the following areas:

Thematisation Units on Fronting, Passivisation, Converse Terms, and Clefting, drawing attention to the relationships within text of given/new and equivalence/contrast.

Cross-reference Anaphoric features in text, including Set Relationships, Pronominalisation, Ellipsis, Definite v. Indefinite Cross-reference, and conventions of cross-reference in academic texts. A good deal of attention is paid to the means of cross-reference which seem to be important from the point of view of disambiguation (e.g. determiner + classifier).

The practice materials are similar to those described under a) and b): a good deal of attention is paid to the identification and interpretation of features of cohesion in 'general academic' texts, and the reconstruction of academic texts, supplying features of cohesion.

2. Features of Coherence

These materials concentrate on the explicit marking of logical/rhetorical relationships within a text by means of logical connectors (the underlying description we are at present using being largely based on Quirk et al. A Grammar of Contemporary English).

Of all the courses described, this is one of those that is most in a state of flux: there remains a great deal more work to be done in polishing and expanding the units already written, and a great deal more supportive research on the theory and analysis of texts, and in error analysis of students' work. Eventually we hope that we may be able to add to the common-core units supplementary subject-oriented materials (c.f. work at Leeds), but we do not think that that will be possible before 1976/7.

4. Academic Writing: Remedial Sheets (Access: 10 units)

We have prepared a certain number of 'mini-units' (none longer than the two sides of an A4 sheet) to deal with recurrent syntactic and lexical errors in students' writing that were not covered elsewhere in the programme, and which can be pinned for self-study to a student's written work as need arises. Typical topics are:

Complementation (to+V, prep+V+ing) of way, method, process, etc.
Actor/patient relationships: give, get, lend, borrow, hire (out), etc.
Inadmissible back-formations: Noun + prep ⟷ Verb + prep
(the) other(s), another
Overgeneralisation of reflexive pronoun

This programme has, to some extent, been overtaken by the development of the course materials, and the inclusion within them of many of the topics originally only covered in the remedial sheets.

.5 Listening Comprehension: Discussion Texts (Language Laboratory. 3 terms work: 25 units).

In 1971-3 listening comprehension work in the language laboratory was based on read extracts from popular scientific journals (e.g. New Scientist, Scientific American), with comprehension and development exercises of various types. This type of text was unsatisfactory for three main reasons: they were too specialised for students outside the subject-area, and usually too general for students within it: they were, particularly those from 'New Scientist', in the register of journalism: and, most important, they represented 'spoken prose' rather than spontaneous utterance. Accordingly, we decided in 1973 to try to use only sponataneous spoken texts. The choice lay between unidirectional texts (e.g. recordings of lectures and talks) and interactive texts (e.g. semi-formal discussion of the type that many students have to handle in seminars and tutorials in their departments). For the former we already had some useful work done by Clive Holes at the University of Birmingham in 1971/2 on the factors affecting the comprehension of lectures by overseas post-graduate students: it was, however, decided to choose the latter, on the grounds that such texts would:

a) present 'chunked' examples of exposition similar to that found in unidirectional texts.

b) show features of interaction absent from unidirectional texts (e.g. turn-taking, questions and answers, agrrement and disagreement, etc.)

c) be more varied and interesting, and provide a context within which it would be natural to stimulate production as well as reception.

There remained the problem of where we should look for texts. While we have done some recording of seminars within departments, and have found the recordings a useful check on our teaching texts and on the materials based on them, the material we have used up to the present has mainly been from the BBC Radio 4 discussion programme 'A Word in Edgways'. This meets the requirement of generality better than most 'real-life' seminars, while it has the following important features for our purpose:

a) It is topic-centred. Each programme 'talks round' a subject or idea put forward by the chairman in a way which is of interest and can be grasped by by the specialist and the non-specialist.

b) Including the chairman, there are 4 participants: enough to provide a range of different points of view, and give rise to interesting features of view, but not so many that it becomes difficult to distinguish the different speakers. Of the four participants, on average two are academics with specialist knowledge of the subject.

c) The chairman 'guides' the discussion to much the same extent and in much the same way as the university seminar-leaders we have recorded. As guided, the discussion develops in a similar fashion, from formal introductory statements of position, towards a freer - and sometimes heated - interchange, into which the chairman may from time to time intervene to redirect the discussion.

The topics of programmes which we have used for teaching purposes range widely, including:

The language of science
The role of capitalism in the western world
The use of mathematical models in economics
The effect of changes in transport on society
Problems of giving aid to underdeveloped countries
Archaeology and history
Violence and the law
Science and the supernatural

Each unit is based on a five-minute extract from the discussion, the rest being placed on access for those students who wish to follow it up in their own time. There is little experience in using 'raw' unscripted discussion of this type as a basis for teaching materials. There are, however, two principles that we have tried to keep to:

a) In using authentic materials, the principle of grading is not abandoned: it is, rather, transferred from control over the text itself to the degree of help that is given the student in handling the text.

b) Since the aim of the materials is to allow the student to take part fully in a similar discussion, the teaching should pass from comprehension within the context of the vocabulary, structures, ideas, and patterns of interaction occurring in the text. The presentation of the unit is usually followed up immediately by a short 'open' discussion with the members of the class.

The format of each unit on which we have settled is as follows:

1) Background Preparation

For many of the units (and in particular for those used at the beginning of the course) we provide a reading-passage for self-study before the lesson, setting out the intellectual background of the ideas discussed in the text, and (where necessary) the development of the discussion up to the start of the text. The passage incorporates and explains (either through context, or the 'key' words and structures in the text.

2) Presentation

The text is recorded on the students' tape-recorders before the beginning of the lesson: from the start of the lesson the student therefore has control over the text. A transcription is provided with annotations of difficult words and phrases and cultural and technical references in the right-hand margin. The extent to which such a transcription should be 'cleaned up' for teaching purposes (i.e. whether it should be a 'competence' or a 'performance' transcription) is a thorny one. Our practice is to punctuate the transcription (keeping the conventions of transcription as consistent as possible), and to indicate false starts and major hesitations, but not minor hesitations, stumbles, or overlappings. In some of the transcriptions we have also included among our conventions the underlining of the main sequence of ideas (omitting repetitions, rephrasings, examples, asides, etc.): students find this particularly useful in the early stages of the course. The use of the transcript varies widely, from allowing the student to make use of it throughout the lesson (especially in the early stages of the course, where we are relying on transfer from the student's knowledge of written English to increase his ability to handle, and his confidence with, spoken English), to finally only giving it to him at the conclusion of the lesson.

3) Comprehension Exercises

We have not adhered to any set sequence of exercises for all units, but have tried out and used a variety of different types, which may be categorised as follows:

Construction of equivalent text

The equivalent text may be a summary (e.g. in reprted speech, or in note form: see B1 above) or, occasionally an expansion or reordering (e.g. where a speaker has spoken elliptically, omitting or confusing stages in a logical argument) of the text, or of part of the text. The methods by which the student is led to construct an e.t. include:

a) Multiple-choice (correct answers combining to form e.t.)
b) Sentence-completion (completed sentences combining or combinable to form e.t.)
c) Blank-filling (e.g. Cloze procedure) of e.t.

Reconstruction of text and text features

Without view of the transcription, reconstructing part of the original text (e.g. blank-filling - 'guided dictation') and recovering features of the text (e.g. lexical items, phrases) from equivalences.

Predictive Comprehension

One way in which this has been tested is to interrupt a (spoken or written) text at a point at which structural and meaning clues allow the native speaker

to predict accurately what will follow. The fragmentation of the text that this would require would, for our purposes, be undesirable, but it is possible to exploit an interesting feature of this type of text to the same ends: that is, the high proportion of uncompleted utterances (whether as a result of interruption or self-interruption) where the probable completion can be recovered from context. Predictive comprehension is usually tested in a multiple-choice format: 'What was speaker A going to say?' A closely-related type of exercise which we have on occasion used, may be called <u>inferential comprehension</u>: for example, which further statements would be likely to be accepted by which speakers on the basis of the arguments in the text?

<u>Identification of function of utterance within context</u>

This represents a type of 'applied discourse analysis'. The exercises which we have developed for this purpose include:

Identification of cross-references (c.f. B3, p.9).

Identification of parenthetical insertions:
Function (drawing attention to effect of key-shift: raised for contrastive or new in relation to matrix utterance, lowered for shared - e.g. rephrasing).
Identification of matrix (e.g. underlining)

Identification of utterance as rhetorical signalling device - e.g.
<u>yes</u> as answer to question/evaluation/matching device/entry attempt/hesitation marker/internal response.
Entry strategies. Prefaces. Metacomments (retrospective and prospective: implications of ellipsis, marked tonicity, & pseudo-clefting).
Function of statement as amplification/restriction/denial/consequence, etc. of previous utterance.
Challenge implicit in question.

4) <u>Production Exercises</u>

Modelling (ususally in drill format) some feature or features of the interchange in the text (c.f. above), leading to discrimination on the basis of appropriacy in context, or of speaker role. The drills also serve to reinforce the vocabulary and the expression of ideas in the text.

6. <u>Seminar Strategies</u> (Presessional: 10 units)

This was conceived as a necessary complement to the language laboratory course described above:

a) It could cover some types of seminar interaction not fully exemplified by the 'Word in Edgways' texts. While it appears that these are parallel to the type of discussion found in a high proportion of Social Science and Arts seminars, in Science and Engineering seminars often have a rather different structure based on the presentation of a formal paper or guided problem-solving, and characterised by a high proportion of question-and-answer exchanges on matters of fact and theory. The resulting language problems include the recognition of the question-type and the implications of the question; the relationship between question and answer; and the handling of side-sequences and follow-up sequences. More research is needed in this area: we are at present analysing the results of a questionnaire on the 'seminar-difficulties' of students in different departments, and hope to look more deeply into the question in 1975/6.

b) It could present the material in a more structured format than that adopted in the materials described under B5, with their (self-imposed) restriction that all practice should derive directly from material in the text. For example, the importance revealed by the texts of metacomment means that it is important in this type of discussion that the overseas student should be able to recognise and discriminate between the common colloquial expressions used to talk <u>about</u> interaction: there is clearly an advantage in grouping these together systematically in a teaching unit rather than just drawing attention to them as they arise in text.

c) It could present the basic strategies in a concentrated form, with an emphasis on production, as part of the presessional course, in order to give the newly-arrived student rather more confidence in approaching his first seminar in

his department, and also prepare the way for further practice with the B5 materials.

In defining the 'basic strategies' for this purpose, we found useful the implications of the idea of control in Sinclair and Couthard Towards the Analyisis of Discourse: the English Used by Teachers and Pupils (Oxford, 1975). This showed that much classroom interaction is highly dependent on the control of the teacher, who 'signals' each change of topic or activity during the lesson: who decides which pupil is to speak and when, and what the nature of the pupil's contribution is to be, and how it is to be evaluated: and who is responsible for checking learning and repairing the interaction if it breaks down. Many of the 'language difficulties' experienced by our students, it seemed to us, were related directly to the extent to which in the seminar situation this teacher-control may be removed, and thereby transferred to the participants. They say, for example, that the seminar leader should 'tell them the right answer' and not let them 'make mistakes': that they are nervous of joining in discussion unprompted, or interrupting and of being interrupted: that they do not know how to make clear what they do not understand. It may even be that, in the absence of overt signalling by the seminar-leader, the complaint that they are unable to follow the 'way the discussion is going' could be a symptom of the withdrawal of control. These may, for many, be cultural as well as linguistic problems: their experience of education at university level (even in cases where English has been used as the medium of instruction) has often been of a more teacher-controlled situation than they find here. Accordingly, the following topics covered in the units relate closely to the problems of 'participant-control' in seminars:

Entry Procedures How, and when, to enter a discussion (including 'non-entry participation' - e.g. low-key yes). The use of prefaces.

Metacomment Comment on the general development of a discussion. Commenting on a previous contribution, and showing how one's own contribution will relate to to it (e.g. agreement/disagreement/amplification/restriction/counter, etc.) Indicating the structure of one's contribution (a way of forestalling interruption!)

Negotiating the point at issue This is closely related to metacomment, and includes the important skills of changing the topic and returning the discussion to a previous point.

Repair Strategies Including the checking of understanding, and indicating various types of communication breakdown.

Questions and Answers (see a) on page 12). Including both questions originating from teacher and from student.

Our practice materials incorporate analyses of exchanges, structured dialogues, and role-playing exercises and games. Their future development will involve continued work on the theoretical underlying description (supported by participation in a research project beginning in 1975/6 at the University of Nancy on the paralinguistic features of didactic discourse), and refinement of the materials (including the incorporation of illustative examples from authentic discourse). (A more detailed description of some of the materials and of the problems of form/function correspondences in this area will be found in T.F. Johns Role-simulation in Academic Discourse: Problems and Principles (mimeo, 1974)).

C Courses for students in particular subject-areas

The materials in these courses are, for the most part, functionally rather than formally defined. However, we separate them from the materials described under B, since these are not part of the 'common-core' programme.

1. Overseas Development Administration Texts (Classroom. 2 terms: approx. 15 units)

This course is based on reading texts drawn from the reading-lists for students in the Institute of Local Government Studies at Birmingham University following diploma and MSc courses. The subject-areas include economics, sociology, urban development, operational research, and the theory and practice of administration.

Comprehension Exercises

These- usually presented orally, and not shown on the handout - are similar to those used for listening comprehension (c.f. B5). Attention has also been paid to the recovery of the meaning of unknown words and phrases from form and context (c.f. A3).

Production Exercises

Here the emphasis has been on the features which seem to be particularly imprtant in texts of this sort, particularly where those features are not included in the materials for the 'common-core' academic writing course (B3), although in one or two cases materials originally constructed for this course have subsequently been adapted for inclusion in the 'common-core'. Among those features we have so far identified are:

a) Metaphor - in particular those major 'metaphorical areas' which seem to of special importance in the coneptual infrastructure of such texts (e.g. ordering, control, and cause-and-effect). The work concentrates on the relationship between concept and metaphor, the handling of ideas in a metaphorical framework, and the possible extension of metaphor.

b) Such rhetorical structures as justification and contrast (the latter including complex contrast and the contrast between the ideal and the real - between what 'is' and what 'should be').

The materials also give more extended and detailed practice within the ideas in the texts on features already included in the 'common-core' materials - e.g. on moving from the general to the particular.

2. Technical English

Our work here has been restricted to the provision of supplementary materials - mostly in the form of weekly tests (17 in number) to A.J, Herbert The Structure of Technical English, which is used for undergraduate engineers at Birmingham, and for postgraduate engineers at Aston.

4. Language in the Classroom (Language laboratory. 1 term: 8 units).

These materials (which may be better classified as 'English for Occupational Purposes' than 'English for Academic Purposes') have been prepared, on an experimental basis, for a weekly class for Commonwealth Fellows in the Institute of Education at Birmingham University. Using the model of description developed by the SSRC research project at Birmingham (c.f. Sinclair & Coulthard), they attempt to show the (non-native English speaking) teacher in an EFL or ESL situation who is required to teach a subject through the medium of English how English is used for teaching in Britain, concentrating on the way Englsih is used to 'get things done' in the classroom, and on the nature of teacher/pupil exchanges.